



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,956	03/15/2005	Jill MacDonald Boyce	PU020426	7058
24498	7590	06/17/2008		
Joseph J. Laks			EXAMINER	
Thomson Licensing LLC			TEKLE, DANIEL T	
2 Independence Way, Patent Operations				
PO Box 5312			ART UNIT	
PRINCETON, NJ 08543			PAPER NUMBER	
			2621	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			06/17/2008	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/527,956

Applicant(s)

MACDONALD BOYCE ET AL.

Examiner

DANIEL TEKLE

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. (US 6,449,352)

Regarding Claim 1: Takahashi et al. discloses a method for providing video on demand playback, comprising: receiving at a VoD player a plurality of program segments, each corresponding to a fractional part of an entire program receiving at VoD player a key table containing packet count information corresponding to the number of data packets contained in at least one of program segments (**fig. 21**); identifying an end point of at least one of said plurality of program segments by counting a number of data packets that are decoded for playback (**column 2 lines 7-18**).

Regarding Claim 2: Takahashi et al. discloses a method according to claim 1 further comprising the step of counting a number of data packets relative to the beginning of a program segment (**column 2 lines 7-18**).

Regarding Claim 3: Takahashi et al. discloses a method according to claim 1 further comprising the step of associating at least one program segment with a unique program identifier (PID) based on information contained in key table (**column 2 lines 24-26**).

Regarding Claim 4: Takahashi et al. discloses a method according to claim 1 further comprising the step of receiving and recording at said VoD player at least part of one of said plurality of program segments during the playback by said VoD player of a previous one of said plurality of program segments (**column 2 lines 7-18**).

Regarding Claim 6: Takahashi et al. discloses a method according to claim 1 further comprising the step of receiving at said VoD player a segment packet count data for one or more of said plurality of program segments, said SPC data identifying a position within a program segment of a received packet containing program segment data (**column 2 lines 7-18**).

Regarding Claim 8: Takahashi et al. discloses a method according to claim 6 further comprising the step of monitoring said SPC field of data packets received at said VoD player (**column 9 lines 1-15**).

Regarding Claim 9: Takahashi et al. discloses a method according to claim 8 further comprising the step of comparing said SPC field data to a number of data packets contained in at least one of said plurality of program segments to identify the occurrence of missing packets (**column 9 lines 1-15**).

Regarding Claim 10: Takahashi et al. discloses a method according to claim 8 further comprising the step of discarding packets received by said VoD player that have SPC

field data values corresponding to packets that have already been stored by said VoD player (**column 9 lines 1-15**).

Regarding Claim 11: Takahashi et al. discloses a method according to claim 8 further comprising the step of counting a number of data packets received by said VoD player for at least one of said plurality of program segments (**column 9 lines 50-63 to column 10 lines 32-45**).

Regarding Claim 12: Takahashi et al. discloses a method according to claim 11 further comprising the step of determining that a segment has been completely received when a total number of packets received for a segment is equal to a total number of packets for segment as identified by said SPC data in said key table (**column 10 lines 18-38**).

Regarding Claim 13: Takahashi et al. discloses a method according to claim 12 further comprising the step of determining an end of a segment based upon a discontinuity in at least one of a system clock reference field and a presentation time stamp field (**column 11 lines 1-19**).

Regarding Claim 14: Takahashi et al. discloses a method for providing video on demand playback, comprising: defining a plurality of program segments, each corresponding to a fractional part of an entire program (**Fig. 21**); transmitting at least two of said plurality of program segments concurrently, with each program segment separately identifiable based upon a unique packet identifier (**column 8 lines 12-20**); broadcasting one or more earlier ones of said plurality of segments, that chronologically

are intended to precede later segments in program, more frequently than later segments **(column 10 lines 32-38)**.

Regarding Claim 15: Takahashi et al. discloses a method according to claim 14 further comprising the step of broadcasting with at least one of said plurality of program segments a key table containing packet count information corresponding to the number of data packets contained in at least one of said program segments **(column 8 lines 12-20)**.

Regarding Claim 16: Takahashi et al. discloses a video on demand player comprising: demultiplexor means for demultiplexing a plurality of multiplexed program segments, each having a unique packet identifier and each corresponding to a fractional part of an entire program **(column 8 lines 21-45)**; storage means for concurrently storing two or more of said plurality of program segments during a predetermined time period **(column 8 lines 21-45)**.

Regarding Claim 17: Takahashi et al. discloses a VoD player according to claim 16 further comprising means for receiving and storing a key table containing packet count information corresponding to a number of data packets contained in at least one of said program segments **(column 18 lines 12-20)**.

Regarding Claim 18: Takahashi et al. discloses a VoD player according to claim 17 further comprising means for identifying at least one of a beginning and an end of one or more of plurality of program segments using said packet count information **(column 10 lines 57-67)**.

Regarding Claim 19: Takahashi et al. discloses a VoD player according to claim 17 further comprising means for determining, based on said packet count information, when a complete set of program segment data packets has been received (**column 10 lines 18-38**).

Regarding Claim 20: Takahashi et al. discloses a VoD player according to claim 17 further comprising means for determining a playback order of said plurality of program segments based on said packet count information (**column 10 lines 32-38**).

Regarding Claim 21: Takahashi et al. discloses a VoD player according to claim 20 further comprising means for playing back in order and without interruption a first and all subsequent ones of plurality of program segments (**column 10 lines 32-38**).

Regarding Claim 22: Takahashi et al. discloses a VoD player according to claim 17 further comprising means for receiving and storing at least a first program segment corresponding to a beginning portion of said entire program on at least one of a different transponder channel and at a different time as compared to a remainder of said program segments (**column 10 line 55 to column 11 line 18**).

Regarding Claim 23-24: Claim 23-24 are reject for same subject matter as claims 14-15 respectively.

Regarding Claim 25: Takahashi et al. discloses a VoD server according to claim 23 further comprising means for transmitting a segment packet count data for one or more of said plurality of program segments, said SPC data identifying a position within a

Art Unit: 2621

program segment of a transmitted packet containing program segment data (**column 8 lines 12-20**).

Regarding Claim 27: Claim 27 is reject for same subject matter as claim 22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5, 7 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. (US 6,449,352) as applied to claims 1-4 above, and further in view of Obata et al. (US 2001/0055318).

Regarding Claim 5: Takahashi et al. discloses all the claimed limitation of claim 1, further Obata et al. discloses the step of beginning a playback of at least one of plurality of program segments responsive to a determination that a preceding one of plurality of segments in program is approaching end point (**paragraph 0040**).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combined Obata et al. invention into Takahashi et al. invention in order to identify the change of between two program.

Regarding Claim 7: Takahashi et al. discloses all the claimed limitation of claim 6, further Obata et al. discloses the SPC data is private data in the adaptation field of the MPEG-2 transport (**paragraph 0039**).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combined Obata et al. invention into Takahashi et al. invention in order to have an option of private or standard video stream.

Regarding Claim 26: Claim 26 is reject for same subject matter as claims 7.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL TEKLE whose telephone number is (571)270-1117. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am to 5:00pm M-R and 7:30-4:00 Every other Friday..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on 571-272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621
/Daniel Tekle/
Examiner, Art Unit 2621